



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/780,831	02/18/2004	Roger D. Hewson		3730
7590 Roger D. Hewson 22 Hewson Rd. P.O. Box 38 South Casco, ME 04077				
		EXAMINER GISHNOCK, NIKOLAI A		
		ART UNIT 3714		
		MAIL DATE 04/04/2008		
		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/780,831

Applicant(s)

HEWSON, ROGER D.

Examiner

Nikolai A. Gishnock

Art Unit

3714

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 19-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 19-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 18 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-85/86)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/17/2004 (Updated)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Inventor's Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

In response to Applicant's amendments filed 12/31/2007, claims 1-18 are cancelled. Claims 19-29 are pending.

Response to Amendment

1. The Declaration under 37 CFR §1.132, filed 12/31/2007, is insufficient to overcome the rejection of claims based upon 35 USC §103(a) as set forth in the last Office action because: The facts presented are not germane to the rejection at issue. The relevance of the evidence presented is directed to features of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator® (MBTI®) personality sorting instrument. Wood at least clearly teaches an invention that is compatible with a number of personality sorters, including MBTI, at Para. 0109-0125. Evidence found in Attachments "A" & "B", which appears to be directed to MBTI alone, is insufficient to demonstrate the non-obviousness of the claims over the Wood, Bouchard, and Buffington references, because the use of MBTI is optional in the invention described in the prior art teachings. Further, the Declaration refers only to the system described in the above referenced application and not to the individual claims of the application. Thus, there is no showing that the objective evidence of nonobviousness is commensurate in scope with the claims. To be given substantial weight in the determination of obviousness or nonobviousness, evidence of secondary considerations must be relevant to the subject matter as claimed, and therefore the Examiner must determine whether there is a nexus between the merits of the claimed invention and the evidence of secondary considerations. *Ashland Oil, Inc. v. Delta Resins & Refractories, Inc.*, 776 F.2d 281, 305 n.42, 227 USPQ 657, 673-674 n. 42 (Fed. Cir. 1985), cert. denied, 475 U.S. 1017 (1986). The term "nexus" designates a factually and legally sufficient connection between the objective

Art Unit: 3714

evidence of nonobviousness and the claimed invention so that the evidence is of probative value in the determination of nonobviousness. *Demaco Corp. v. F. Von Langsdorff Licensing Ltd.*, 851 F.2d 1387, 7 USPQ2d 1222 (Fed. Cir.), cert. denied, 488 U.S. 956 (1988). In regards to Attachment "C", pages 1-2, it appears that the Applicant compares "Topics" of the invention, rather than the claims, to supposed features of MBTI, and on page 3, compares the claimed functions to the personality categories of MBTI. Attachment "C", however, appears to convey opinion and argument rather than provide a basis of facts. Although an affidavit or declaration which states only conclusions may have some probative value, such an affidavit or declaration may have little weight when considered in light of all the evidence of record in the application. *In re Brandstadter*, 484 F.2d 1395, 179 USPQ 286 (CCPA 1973). See MPEP § 716.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement filed 5/17/2004 has been reconsidered upon Examiner's location of the references under citations H & J. However, copies of Non-Patent Literature citations K, L, M, N, & P have not been presented. Henceforth, the IDS continues to fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed. A revised initialed IDS is thus included indicating consideration of cited references H & J.

Specification

3. The amendment filed 12/31/2007, see pages 3-4, is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: The amendment to Paragraph

Art Unit: 3714

0046, reciting the limitation, "Guiding individuals to first use the left-brain-style cognitive function in each pair before using the right-brain-style cognitive function in the pair for most effective use of both". While support is found in the Specification for a code of application of the twelve functions, including being appropriate to use the left-brain-style function in each pair first, to prepare for use of the right-brain-style next, at Paragraph 0149, on page 35, support was not found in the Disclosure as originally filed for guiding an individual to use the code or use the left-brain function first. Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 22, 25, & 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. While support is found in the Specification for a code of application of the twelve functions, including being appropriate to use the left-brain-style function in each pair first, to prepare for use of the right-brain-style next, at Paragraph 0149, on page 35, support was not found in the Disclosure as originally filed for enabling one or more individuals or an entity to utilize the cognitive functions matched in the pairs, wherein the left-brain-style cognitive function in each of the pairs of the complementary and polar-opposite cognitive functions is most appropriately utilized before the right-brain-style cognitive function in the pair.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

8. Claims 19-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood et al. (US 2002/0045154 A1), hereinafter known as Wood.

9. Wood broadly teaches: (a) defining attributes, characteristics, and purpose of each of a group of twelve cognitive functions (an objective of the invention is to provide a method and system for determining and classifying an individual's "personality DNA" based upon various personality instruments, behavior, psychographics, demographics, beliefs, and preferences, Para. 0040), wherein the twelve cognitive functions comprise reality (down-to-earth, Para. 0225), imagination (creative, Para. 0214), analysis (intelligent, understanding, Para. 0217), intuition (Individualistic, Intuitive, Para. 0211), listening (absorbed, non-verbal, Para. 0222), expressing (articulate, expressive, dramatic, Para. 0212), cooperation (Team Player, contributor, Para. 0224), independence (loners, freedom, Para. 0221), caution (conscientious, responsible, Para. 0223), courage (bold, entrepreneurial, Para. 0219), adaptability (selfless, adaptable, Para. 0213), and decisiveness (Born Leader, take-charge, Para. 0216) functions; (b)

Art Unit: 3714

defining the structure of a cognitive architecture system with the twelve functions working together in a complementary way (In accordance with the present invention, a personality is defined depending on which groupings of characteristics are chosen. The system allows for selection of a large number of combinations of characteristics, and therefore allows for many different personality definitions and measuring schemes. Since a user's personality is made up of a number of characteristics, the present invention identifies and measures the characteristics of the user to classify the user into a selected personality scheme, and matches advice, content, and other people with the user based upon the results of selected tests, Para. 0045; it is understood that a grouping of characteristics that define a personality work together in a complementary way); (c) documenting the structure in a document comprising one or more of a computer, electronic medium, video, paper, verbal, and audio formats (Still another advantage of the present invention is that it makes possible the creation and delivery of content, advice, and people profiles determined from a user's responses to a series of personality tests, demographics questions, both on-line and off-line behavior, psychographic testing, life style and quality of life questions, Para. 0050; on-line behavior is at least representative of computer and electronic medium formats documenting the structure of a cognitive system); (d) utilizing the document to educate one or more individuals about the structure of the cognitive architecture system (An important advantage of the present invention is that it allows a user to perform an online self evaluation of his personality traits and characteristics, Para. 0049; self-evaluation is understood to be an educational process); (e1) enabling the one or more individuals to determine the magnitude of preference for each of the group of twelve cognitive functions of an entity (the present invention identifies and measures the characteristics of the user to classify the user into a selected personality scheme, Para. 0045), utilizing a preference survey instrument, wherein the entity is one or more individuals (user completes a personality test or a

psychographics questionnaire, Para. 0176); (e2) wherein the determining of the magnitude of preference is based on knowledge of innate cognitive preferences, observed cognitive actions, and other cognitive behaviors of the entity (user's responses to a series of personality tests, both on-line and off-line behavior {observed actions and behaviors} and life style quality of life questions {preferences}, Para. 0050); (e3) calculating the results of the preference survey instrument (In accordance with the present invention, raw data provided by each user via their answers and behaviors and collected are scored and compiled by algorithms and standardized into alphanumeric representations, Para. 0181) and providing the results in the document format (the system gathers information from database such as declared preferences, purchase history, page view history, and click history of the individual, and compares this with the personality, psychographic, behavior, and declared preference relevance values from all users to determine the optimum content to display to the user. Content selected includes, but is not limited to, raw scores on each scale, graphical representations of the scores, the title of the node or classification, and descriptive text of the user's personality classification. Content selected may also include stories, news, articles, and information, Para. 0295-0297; the results are understood to include at least computer and electronic medium formats); (f) enabling the one or more individuals to calculate the results of the preference survey instrument to quantify the magnitude of preference for each of the functions, and to document a preference survey report indicating the magnitude of preference for each of the twelve cognitive functions in one or more of a computer, electronic medium, video, paper, verbal, and audio formats (Para. 0181 and 0295-0297; the user of Wood's system is, in this case, an enabled individual); (g) enabling one or more individuals to utilize the cognitive architecture system of the twelve cognitive functions and the determination of the magnitude of preference (dominance of a trait, Para. 0019) for: (g1) defining the entity's magnitude of preference for the twelve functions (the system compares a

Art Unit: 3714

user's scores and results against the classification scheme, the system then determines the closest match and presents that classification to the user, Para. 0282); (g2) defining the strengths and weaknesses of the entity (the degree to which the user scored, or was categorized in a particular scale, is represented numerically and presented with the letters to represent relative strength of the scales, Para. 0233); (g3) defining the purpose of understanding and developing better working relations based on the entity's magnitude of preference (invention matches content, advice, and people {to a user} based on the data provided and the classifications determined, Para. 0284); (g4) matching the entity with lifestyle activity roles and employment activities (A user wishing to receive career advice may be asked to provide job attribute preferences (i.e. Working outside, attention to detail, working on teams). A user wishing to receive relationship advice may be asked to provide preference information for behavior in their partner, Para. 0153); (g5) assisting the entity in using each of the cognitive functions (Many companies try to improve communication between employees and offer workshops and seminars to foster better understanding and communication among employees. If each employee can understand the values and motivations behind his/her own personality type and then understand those of the other types, then personality-based conflicts can be recognized, understood, and better managed. This leads to a healthier work environment and higher productivity, Para. 0037); (g6) assisting the entity in selecting the cognitive functions most appropriate for use at a specific moment or situation (module is designed to offer personalized advice to users based upon personality, psychographics, demographics, behavior, declared preferences and any other data gathered, Para. 0305; it is understood this advice is tailored by selection of preferences for cognitive functions {personality}, and inherently selected based on the specific moment of a user's inquiry; and in regard to a specific situation {career, relationships, and financial advice}); and (g7) assisting the entity in selecting the appropriate

Art Unit: 3714

sequence of using the cognitive functions (Para. 0037; inherently, managing and using personality functions is done in sequence); and (i) providing one or more individuals with the documentation of the preference survey instrument, the preference survey report, the structure of the architecture system, in the document format (the system can construct and/or deliver promotions and advertisements in real time. This is used when the user views a page with ads, or the system delivers promotional materials via email or other electronic means. This information together with the rest of the user's profile is compared to all available content and is used to select the subject matter, the layout, and style of the promotional material, Para. 0299; the system can also construct page layouts according to the user's classification including color, font, use of graphics, and presentation of data, video and audio content, Para. 0303) [Claims 19, 24, & 27].

10. Wood further broadly teaches: (a) segmenting the twelve cognitive functions into two column sets (Whole Brain Model comprises thinking styles linked to particular regions of the brain, with processes occurring on either the left or the right, Para. 0010-0019); (a1) wherein a left column set of six functions shares a left-brain style of cognition comprising the reality, analysis, listening, cooperation, caution, and adaptability functions (analytical, quantitative, fact-based, Para. 0012); and (a2) wherein a right column set of six functions shares a right-brain style of cognition comprising the imagination, intuition, expressing, independence, courage, and decisiveness functions (intuitive, holistic, integrating, synthesizing, Para. 0014); (c) defining the effectiveness of each of the functions as increased by using it in a complementary way with the opposite function in the pair; and defining how each function provides abilities the other lacks (In Herrmann's model, the four clusters of processing are typically available in each person, but one or more of the clusters is naturally dominant in a person's temperament, similar to Jung's theory. Through two decades of testing and applying his model to organizations, Herrmann

Art Unit: 3714

amassed findings which indicate that the population is evenly distributed among these four types of thinking specialties. This data suggests that groups and societies operate in such a way that each person's specialties of thought are balanced among the group as a whole. Although people are not all created equal, different styles of thinking appear to serve equally weighed roles in balancing each other to optimally achieve the group's common purposes, Para. 0010-0019); (d) documenting the structure of the cognitive architecture system matched in pairs in a document format (Content selected includes, but is not limited to, raw scores on each scale, graphical representations of the scores, the title of the node or classification, and descriptive text of the user's personality classification. Content selected may also include stories, news, articles, and information, Para. 0295-0297); (e) using the matched pairs of functions to enable the entity to increase competence in utilizing the functions in a complementary and effective way (If each employee can understand the values and motivations behind his/her own personality type and then understand those of the other types, then personality-based conflicts can be recognized, understood, and better managed. This leads to a healthier work environment and higher productivity, Para. 0037) [Claims 21, 24, & 27].

11. What Wood fails to teach is: (b) defining the groups of left-brain and right-brain styles as matched in pairs; wherein reality is paired with imagination, analysis with intuition, listening with expressing, cooperation with independence, caution with courage, and adaptability with decisiveness. However, Applicant has not disclosed that having the functions paired as specified solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose. Moreover, it appears that the pairings of Extroversion with Introversion, Sensation with Intuition, Thinking with Feeling, and Judging with Perceiving of Wood (Para. 0227-0231) or the Applicant's instant invention would perform equally well for pairing cognitive functions based on left-brain- or right-brain-dominant-thinking styles. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art, at the time the invention was made, to have modified Wood such that the pairs consist of said functions of Reality with Imagination, Analysis with Intuition, Listening with Expressing, Cooperation with Independence, Caution with Courage, and Adaptability with Decisiveness, because such a modification would have been considered a mere design consideration, which fails to patentably distinguish over Wood [Claims 21, 24, & 27].

12. Wood teaches the further step of six of the cognitive functions with the highest magnitudes of preference among the twelve cognitive functions referred to as potential strengths, and six of the cognitive functions with the lowest magnitudes of preference are referred to as potential weaknesses [Claim 20], and the further step of defining that the cognitive function with the higher magnitude of preference in each of the pairs is referred to as a potential strength, and the cognitive function with the lower magnitude of preference in each of the pairs is referred to as a potential weakness [Claims 23, 26, & 29] (the degree to which the user scored, or was categorized in a particular scale, is represented numerically and presented with the letters to represent relative strength of the scales, Para. 0233; the relative strength of the categories of Wood implicitly may be referred to as "potential strengths" and "potential weaknesses"; Within {the} database, all of this content is stored and each element is recorded with a relative relevance strength indicator. A strength indicator value is stored in database for each node for each classification scheme available, Para. 0290) [Claims 20, 23, 26, & 29].

13. Wood teaches the step of appropriately utilizing the cognitive functions matched in the pairs, wherein the left-brain-style cognitive function in each of the pairs of the complementary and polar-opposite cognitive functions is most appropriately utilized before the right-brain-style cognitive function in the pair to prepare the right-brain-style cognitive function to be utilized more effectively, enabling the entity to utilize each of the group of twelve cognitive functions in the appropriate sequence to further improve competence, effectiveness, and productivity in

everyday real-life situations (In the 1970's and '80s, Ned Herrmann conceived of different modes of thought occurring in various regions of the brain, in the higher level cortex and lower level limbic system. His Whole Brain Model comprised four quadrants of thinking styles linked to particular regions of the brain, with processes occurring on the left or right; In Herrmann's model, the four clusters of processing are typically available in each person, but one or more of the clusters is naturally dominant in a person's temperament, similar to Jung's theory. Through two decades of testing and applying his model to organizations, Herrmann amassed findings which indicate that the population is evenly distributed among these four types of thinking specialties. That is, 25% of the people show dominance in A-type analytical thinking, another 25% show dominance in B-type organized thinking, and so on around all four quadrants. This data suggests that groups and societies operate in such a way that each person's specialties of thought are balanced among the group as a whole. Although people are not all created equal, different styles of thinking appear to serve equally weighed roles in balancing each other to optimally achieve the group's common purposes. This generally fits with data in the 1970's by psychologists David Keirsey and Marilyn Bates. Their studies of married couples with Myers-Briggs testing showed an equal distribution among particular personality types: 25% were TJ's (favoring Thinking with Judging), 25% were FJ's (Feeling with Judging), 25% FP's (Feeling with Perceiving), and 25% TP's (Thinking with Perceiving). These Myers-Briggs types roughly equate to sides of the square Herrmann model (Herrman's AB side being TJ's, BC side FJ's, and so on). This data corroborates the understanding of thinking styles as a system in which each combination of thinking processes is offset and balanced by its corresponding opposite among the population as a whole, Para. 0010-0019; It is understood that the different styles of thinking reflect the use of both left-brain-style-first and right-brain-style-first thinking, and that the balancing of different styles of thinking among a population of left- and right- brain thinkers to

Art Unit: 3714

optimally achieve the group's common purposes, causes improvement of competence, effectiveness, and productivity in everyday real-life situations) [Claims 22, 25, & 28].

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments filed 12/31/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

15. Applicant states at the top of page 24 that an extensive ten-year, more than 10,000 hour research effort gradually evolved into this invention, which included repeated trial-and-error experimentation and validation. The Examiner thus suggests that evidence of this research and any conclusions, based on facts, that support a finding on non-obviousness of the instant claims over the prior art cited, would constitute a more convincing Declaration under 37 CFR §1.131.

16. Applicant further fails to demonstrate any "long-felt need" or "failure of others", because the evidence provided in Attachments "A" and "B" are dated 2004 and 2007, respectively. While there is no explicit time requirement for long-felt need, a period of need greater than a decade is usually found convincing. Additionally, there is no showing that others of ordinary skill in the art were working on the problem and if so, for how long; and there is no evidence that if persons skilled in the art who were presumably working on the problem knew of the teachings of the above cited references, they would still be unable to solve the problem. See MPEP §716.04.

17. The Applicant also states on page 24, third paragraph, that there is significant difference between "right- and left-brain thinking" and "'right-brain-style' and 'left-brain-style'" as claimed, however, no further facts or argument is presented, thus the statement appears to be a mere allegation.

18. The Applicant further states on Pages 25-26 of remarks that "one skilled in the art" would have common knowledge about the cognitive architecture system as claimed. This

statement seems to agree with the Examiner's finding that the claims are obvious, in view of the Wood reference and common knowledge.

19. In regards to Applicants request for assistance in writing claim language, see page 30, paragraph 4, according to MPEP 707.04(j), the practice of suggesting claim language is used when it becomes apparent to the Examiner that there is patentable subject matter disclosed in the application; however, it is not clear to the Examiner at the present time what patentable subject matter is disclosed.

20. Applicant states on page 31, second full paragraph, that Applicant provided missing items in IDS by fax on November 6, 2007. However, Examiner has no record of fax information. Applicant should submit copies of cited references K, L, M, N, & P with response in order to be officially considered.

21. Applicant states on page 32-33 that Wood fails to teach cognitive functions, and rather teaches traits instead, However, it is understood by the Examiner that in the psychology art, cognitive functions refer to processes such as memory, attention, perception, action, problem solving and mental imagery (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cognition>), and that the categories of the sectors disclosed by Applicant in Paragraph 0044, pages 13-14 of the Specification, are in fact cognitive traits. Further, Applicant discloses identifying the exact cognitive traits common to each cognitive function in Paragraph 0043, Page 13 of the Specification.

22. Applicant further argues at pages 32-35 that Wood fails to teach a set of twelve cognitive functions, covering the full spectrum of cognition. However, Wood clearly teaches using personality tests comprising at least twelve functions, including MBTI, Keirsey, etc. The naming of the twelve functions, pairs, sectors, quadrants, etc. does not have to explicitly match the instant claim language, if it is clear that the functions are equivalent. There is no language in either the instant claim language or the Applicant's Disclosure that limits the number of functions

Art Unit: 3714

to exactly twelve. In regards to an anticipation rejection under 35 USC 102, the elements must be arranged as required by the claim, but this is not an *ipse dixit* test, i.e., identity of terminology is not required. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990). See MPEP 2131.

23. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

24. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Cuttler et al. (US 7,346,541 B1) discloses a system and method for providing a personality predictive survey to a job applicant.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3714

25. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nikolai A. Gishnock whose telephone number is (571)272-1420. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30a-5p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Xuan M. Thai can be reached on 571-272-7147. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

3/31/2008
/N. A. G./
Examiner, Art Unit 3714

/Ronald Laneau/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3714